

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
NOVEMBER 16, 1960

The Commission of Fine Arts met pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., with David E. Finley, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: David E. Finley  
Douglas W. Orr  
Ralph W. Walker  
Michael Rapuano  
Felix W. de Weldon

L.R. Wilson, Secretary  
Charles H. Atherton, Asst. Sec'y  
C.L. Martin, Counsel

1. General Services Administration  
Public Buildings Service  
Preliminary Plans for the Development of a Court Building on the  
East Side of Lafayette Square

The Commission met with representatives of the Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration; Mr. Robert E. Dean of the firm of Perry, Shaw, Hepburn and Dean; and Mr. Joseph Richardson, of the firm of Shepley, Bullfinch, Richardson and Abbott, to consider plans for the design and location of a courthouse building on the east side of Lafayette Square along Madison Place for the United States Court of Claims and the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Mr. Dean explained the plan through the use of drawings and a scale model which showed the White House and the three sides of the Square. The building shown in the drawings was an individual building separated from the Treasury Annex building by a sunken garden and set back from the street a distance of approximately 20 feet. A dry moat six feet deep separated the building from Madison Place.

The members of the Commission were critical of two aspects of the plan. They believed that the court building should be placed in such a position that no space would exist between it and the existing Treasury Annex, and secondly, that the dry moat would be an unfortunate mistake. The members believed that there should not be a separation between the court building and the unfinished Treasury Annex which would open up to view the rear of the private buildings facing Fourteenth Street. Furthermore, they believed that the court building should be located in a formal setting in relation to its site on Madison Place and Lafayette Square and that studies of the building should be made in an ideal location. It was agreed that the court building should not be a massive structure



directly abutting the sidewalk and taking up all of the site along Madison Place. They believed that the concept of a dry moat was not desirable because it created too great a separation between the building and the street and the rest of Lafayette Square.

The members were of the opinion that the architects had not carried out the agreement made at the joint meeting with the National Capital Planning Commission on September 8, 1960, that the east side of Lafayette Square should be designed as an entity. The Commission did not oppose the general concept of the scheme presented except to the extent that it did not conform to agreement reached at the September meeting.

The Commission requested the architects to return with studies of the location of the court building as it would appear if the Treasury Annex were removed and, alternately as it might appear if the Treasury Annex were to be remodelled. The architects were also requested to present studies showing both sides of the Square. The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter setting forth the recommendations of the Commission.

EXHIBIT A

## 2. Discussion

### a. Addition to the Arlington National Cemetery

The Commission approved the draft of a letter to the Director of Administration, Office of the Quartermaster General, Department of the Army, reaffirming the approval of a plan for the expansion of the Arlington National Cemetery (Area Plan No. 6608-146).

EXHIBIT B

### b. Abolishment of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission (P.L. 397/86th C)

The Commission approved the draft of a letter to the Acting Director of Administration, Office of the Quartermaster General, Department of the Army, stating it's understanding of the agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the office of the President in regard to the submission by the Department of Defense of matters of design or location of memorials in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater grounds to the Commission for its advice.

At 12:45 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

*C.L. Martin*

C.L. Martin  
Counsel

Approved:

*L.R. Wilson*  
L.R. Wilson  
Secretary



MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
NOVEMBER 16, 1960

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- 9:30 a.m. 1. CONVENE. ROOM 7000. INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
- 9:40 a.m. 2. GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION. PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE:  
(Mr. L.L. Hunter, Asst. Commissioner for Design and Construction, PBS; Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Architectural and Structural Div., PBS; Mr. John E. Cudd, Liaison Architect, PBS; Mr. Robert C. Dean, Perry, Shaw, Hepburn & Dean; Mr. Joseph Richardson, Shepley, Bulfinch, Richardson and Abbott; Mr. Andrew H. Hepburn, Perry, Shaw, Hepburn & Dean)

Lafayette Square, Development of East Side



22 November 1960

Dear Mr. Floete:

At their meeting on November 16, 1960, the members of the Commission of Fine Arts were glad to meet with representatives of the Public Buildings Service and the architects to consider further studies for the location of a new building to house the United States Court of Claims and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, on the east side of Lafayette Square along Madison Place. Representatives of the National Capital Planning Commission were also present.

The plans were explained by Mr. Robert C. Dean, of the firm of Perry, Shaw, Hopturn and Dean, and Mr. Joseph Richardson of the firm of Shepley, Bulfinch, Richardson and Abbott. The presentation consisted of drawings and a scale model which showed the proposed structure in relation to the White House and the other three sides of Lafayette Square.

In discussing the design, it was recalled that at a joint meeting with the National Capital Planning Commission on September 8, 1960, it was agreed that the east side of Lafayette Square should be designed in its entirety. The presentation made by the architects neglected that agreement and showed an attempt to solve the problem by leaving the Treasury Annex isolated on the corner and utilizing the rest of the space to accommodate the Courts. The Commission accordingly did not take a position against the architects' scheme as it was presented, except to the extent that it did not fulfill the original understanding and agreement. We felt that while there might seem to be no possibility of removing the Treasury Annex at the present time, a study should be made, placing the new building for the two Courts in such a position on Madison Place that, were the Treasury Annex eventually removed, the proper relationship of the Court Building to Lafayette Square would result.

We thought further that it would be very unfortunate to have the plans on having the entrance to the building on Madison Place through a dry moat, as shown in the model and drawings; also, in our opinion, it would be unfortunate to move the Court building northward to the corner leaving a void between it and the Treasury Annex.



Inasmuch as the President has expressed his keen interest in the development of the new buildings facing Lafayette Square, the Commission felt that it would be remiss in its duty if it did not insist on having the designs for both the east and west sides developed simultaneously in an ideal manner for consideration. Therefore, at our meeting, we urged your representatives and the architects to prepare studies showing both sides of the Square. In particular, we urged them to study the location of the Court building as it would appear if the Treasury Annex were to be removed, and, alternately as it might appear if the Treasury Annex were to be remodelled. The architects agreed to prepare these studies and time will be reserved for them to present them to the Commission at the December meeting of the Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley  
Chairman

Honorable Franklin Fleet  
Administrator  
General Services Administration  
Washington 25, D.C.

The Commission has been informed by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines that the Government has decided to withdraw its application for membership in the Commission. The Commission has decided to accept the withdrawal of the application.

17 November 1960

Dear Colonel Hartman:

At their meeting of September 21, 1960, the members of the Commission of Fine Arts examined your letter of 18 August 1960 and the enclosed plan for the expansion of Arlington National Cemetery (Area Plan No. 6608-146) into the Arlington Farms Tract.

After noting that the plan was essentially the same as the plan which the Commission of Fine Arts approved on July 2, 1952, the members reaffirmed the previous approval.

We shall be glad to confer with you in the future when detailed plans and drawings for the project have been completed.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley  
Chairman

Colonel Roland F. Hartman  
Acting Director of Administration  
Office of the Quartermaster General  
Department of the Army  
Washington 25, D. C.



14 November 1960

Dear Colonel Hartman:

I am writing you in regard to the abolishment of the Arlington Amphitheater Commission, which was accomplished by a recent act of Congress (S. 3264). As you know, the authority of the Amphitheater Commission was transferred to the Secretary of Defense. However, through an oversight the legislation failed to include a provision similar to Section 5 of the Public Law 397 (66th Congress) that the character, design and location of inscriptions, busts, or other memorials shall be subject to the approval of the Memorial Commission, "which shall in each case obtain the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts." In addition, the recent act did not contain the provision in Public Law 397 that "no memorial shall be placed and no body interred in the grounds about the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater within a distance of two hundred and fifty feet from said memorial."

Because of these omissions in the legislation the Commission of Fine Arts wrote to the Bureau of the Budget urging that if the bill was signed by the President, administrative measures be taken to assure consultation between the Secretary of Defense and this Commission such as was provided for in Public Law 397.

Subsequently, the Bureau of the Budget sent us a copy of a letter to the Secretary of Defense stating that members of the Secretary's staff had agreed that the Department of Defense will not approve the character, design, or location of memorials under the new authority without first obtaining the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The purpose of this letter is to confirm with your office the nature of this understanding between the office of the President and the Secretary of Defense. For your information I am enclosing a copy of our letter to the Bureau of the Budget dated August 25, 1960.

We will be glad to confer with you any time that you have preliminary plans for changes or additions to memorials on the Amphitheater grounds.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley  
Chairman

Colonel Roland F. Hartman  
Acting Director of Administration  
Office of the Quartermaster General  
Department of the Army  
Washington 25, D.C.

EXHIBIT C



15 December 1960

The meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts set for December 13 and 14, 1960 was postponed due to difficult travel conditions brought on by a large snow storm which covered the entire eastern United States.

On December 13, about noon, Mr. de Weldon and Mr. Hurd appeared at the Commission's offices for the meeting, but they and the Chairman were the only members of the Commission able to be present. The two members and the Chairman did not constitute a quorum and the meeting could not be held. Mr. de Weldon and Mr. Hurd looked at sketches of the proposed Four Chaplain's Medal and suggested that the eagle should be placed on a shield so as to eliminate the unpleasant effect created by the wings of the eagle that were visible on the reverse side of the medal.

The Chairman directed the Secretary to send a telegram to the members suggesting that a meeting be held on January 3 and 4, 1961 and requesting that the members advise if those days were suitable.

EXHIBIT A

On December 14, having been advised by some of the members that they could not attend a meeting on January 3 and 4, it was determined that all of the members could attend a meeting on January 10 and 11 and the next meeting was scheduled on those days. A telegram was sent announcing the meeting and informing the members that the regularly scheduled meeting on January 17 and 18, 1961 was cancelled. EXHIBIT B

The agenda of the meeting on December 13 and 14, 1960 is attached as EXHIBIT C, and it will be considered the agenda for the January meeting as far as possible.

*C. L. Martin*  
C. L. Martin  
Counsel

Approved:

*L. R. Wilson*  
L. R. Wilson  
Secretary

In the second part, the focus shifts to the implementation of these practices across different departments. It details the specific steps taken to ensure that all employees are aware of their responsibilities and are following the established protocols. The document also addresses any challenges encountered during the process and provides solutions to overcome them. Finally, it concludes with a summary of the key findings and a call to action for continued improvement.

ORIGINAL

OFFICIAL TELEGRAM

Exhibit A

Charge at Government Rate to  
The Commission of Fine Arts

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Telegraph Co.,

13 December, 1960

Send to

Western Union Tel.Co.  
See attached list

Meeting scheduled today and tomorrow postponed due to  
difficult travel conditions stop Suggest January third and  
fourth stop Please advise suitability

L. R. Wilson  
Secretary

*Sent over phone by M 42  
12/13/60*

Official Identification Card No.



Send to:

Honorable Douglas W. Orr  
111 Whitney Avenue  
New Haven 10, Conn.

Honorable Ralph Walker  
Voorhees, Walker, Smith, Smith and Haines  
101 Park Avenue  
New York 17, N.Y.

Honorable William G. Perry  
955 Park Square Building  
Boston 16, Mass.

Honorable Michael Rapuano  
830 Third Avenue  
New York 22, N.Y.

Send to:

Honorable Douglas W. Orr  
111 Whitney Avenue  
New Haven 10, Conn.

Honorable Ralph Walker  
Voorhees, Walker, Smith and Haines  
101 Park Avenue  
New York 17, N.Y.

Honorable William G. Perry  
912 Park Square Building  
Boston 10, Mass.

Honorable Michael Rappaport  
800 Third Avenue  
New York 22, N.Y.

ORIGINAL

OFFICIAL TELEGRAM

EXHIBIT B

Charge at Government Rate to  
The Commission of Fine Arts  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

14 December, 1960

Telegraph Co.,

Send to

Western Union  
See Attached List

Postponed meeting Commission will be held tenth and eleventh  
January not third and fourth as proposed in yesterdays telegram stop  
Meeting on Seventeenth Eighteenth cancelled.

  
L.R. Wilson  
Secretary

Phoned 12/14/60

Official Identification Card No.

(Phoned Mr. deWeldon)



MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
DECEMBER 13, 1960

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- 2:00 p.m.
1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
  2. ADMINISTRATION
    - a. Date of Next Meeting: 18 January 1961  
Executive Session: 17 January 1961
    - b. Approval of Minutes
    - c. Letter to The President
    - d. Tender of Resignation-Mr. William Perry
  3. SUBMISSIONS - INTERVIEWS
    - a. Department of the Army, Office of the Quartermaster General, Heraldic Branch  
Four Chaplains Medal, Revised Design
    - b. National Capital Downtown Committee  
Redevelopment Plan for "Downtown Business District"
    - c. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service  
Court House - Lafayette Square - East Side
    - d. Department of the Interior  
National Park Service, National Capital Parks  
George Washington Memorial Parkway, Cabin John Bridge, Revised Design
- 4:00 p.m.
- d. District of Columbia Government
    - (1) Conference on Mutual Responsibilities (Engineer Commissioner, General Clarke) OG 2654 106 2649
    - (2) Design Standards for Schools and Libraries (Mr. Blaser, Director, D.C. Department of Bligs and Grounds)

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

THE EFFECT OF THE INFLUENZA VIRUS ON THE  
RESISTANCE OF THE BODY

BY  
DR. J. H. HAY,  
CHICAGO, ILL.  
AND  
DR. W. C. KENDRICK,  
CHICAGO, ILL.

Read at the meeting of the American Medical Association,  
Chicago, Ill., June 15, 1914.

Received for publication, April 15, 1914.

Revised manuscript received, May 15, 1914.

From the Department of Pathology, University of Chicago,  
Chicago, Ill.

Reprints may be ordered from the American Medical Association,  
535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1914, by American Medical Association

Published by the American Medical Association,  
535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter, June 15, 1914,  
under special rate of postage provided for in  
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 16, 1918.

Postage paid at Chicago, Ill.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in  
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 16, 1918.

Published weekly, except during the summer months, when it is  
published bi-weekly. Subscription price, \$5.00 per annum in  
advance. Single copies, 15 cents.

- e. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds  
(Mr. G.A. Purcell, Dept. of Bldgs and Grounds; Mr. Louis Justement, architect)

District of Columbia General Hospital, Consolidation

- f. District of Columbia Government, Department of Highways and Traffic (Mr. Harold Aitken, Dir. of Highways and Traffic)

- (1) Inner Loop Freeway between K Street and Lincoln Memorial
- (2) Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, Virginia Approaches
- (3) E Street Freeway between 22d and 23d Streets, at Entrance to State Department

#### 4. DISCUSSION

- a. Draft of a letter reference Veterans Administration Hospital Parking
- b. Draft of a letter to Mount Vernon Ladies Association re Protective Measures
- c. Chairman's conference with General Calloway and Colonel Martz relative to Director for Institute of Heraldry

#### 5. REVIEW

- a. Great Plaza Development, Removal of Tempos
- b. Relocation of Statue of Dr. Benjamin Rush
- c. Letter from Office of Quartermaster General reference Arlington Cemetery
- d. Letter from National Park Service, reference Up-Keep of Parks

#### 6. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

Review and Confirmation of Actions of Shipstead-Luce Panel  
(Appendix 1 dated 12/13/60)

#### 7. OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

- a. Review and Confirmation of Actions of Old Georgetown Board  
(Appendix 2 dated 12/13/60)
- b. O.G. 2699, 1046 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. - Razing

1. The first of the two main points is that the  
the first of the two main points is that the  
the first of the two main points is that the

2. The second of the two main points is that the  
the second of the two main points is that the  
the second of the two main points is that the

3. The third of the two main points is that the  
the third of the two main points is that the  
the third of the two main points is that the

4. The fourth of the two main points is that the  
the fourth of the two main points is that the  
the fourth of the two main points is that the

5. The fifth of the two main points is that the  
the fifth of the two main points is that the  
the fifth of the two main points is that the

6. The sixth of the two main points is that the  
the sixth of the two main points is that the  
the sixth of the two main points is that the

7. The seventh of the two main points is that the  
the seventh of the two main points is that the  
the seventh of the two main points is that the

8. The eighth of the two main points is that the  
the eighth of the two main points is that the  
the eighth of the two main points is that the

9. The ninth of the two main points is that the  
the ninth of the two main points is that the  
the ninth of the two main points is that the

10. The tenth of the two main points is that the  
the tenth of the two main points is that the  
the tenth of the two main points is that the

11. The eleventh of the two main points is that the  
the eleventh of the two main points is that the  
the eleventh of the two main points is that the

12. The twelfth of the two main points is that the  
the twelfth of the two main points is that the  
the twelfth of the two main points is that the

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
DECEMBER 14, 1960

ORDER OF BUSINESS

9:30 a.m. 1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING.

2. SUBMISSIONS - INTERVIEWS:

9:35 a.m. a. General Services Administration, Public Bldgs. Service:  
(Mr. L. L. Hunter, Asst. Comm'r. for Design & Construction; Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Arch'l. & Structural Div; Mr. John E. Cudd, Liaison Arch., PBS; Mr. Robert C. Dean, Mr. Andrew H. Hepburn, Perry, Shaw, Hepburn & Dean; Mr. Joseph Richardson, Shepley, Bulfinch, Richardson & Abbott; Mr. J. P. Carlhian)

Court House-East side of Lafayette Square.

11:00 a.m. b. National Capital Downtown Committee:  
(Mr. Knox Banner, Executive Director; Mr. Leo Stern, Deputy Director, Mr. Melvin Levine, Chief Planner, Paul D. Spreiregen, Planning Designer)

Redevelopment Plan for "Downtown Business District."

11:45 a.m. c. Interior Dept., National Park Service, National Capital Parks: (Mr. Wm. M. Haussmann, Chief, Arch'l. Branch)

GWMP, Cabin John Bridge-Revised design.

~~12:10 p.m.~~

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

1. The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the department. It is a very interesting and informative account of the work of the department during the past year. The second part of the report deals with the work of the department during the past year. It is a very interesting and informative account of the work of the department during the past year.

2. The second part of the report deals with the work of the department during the past year. It is a very interesting and informative account of the work of the department during the past year.

3. The third part of the report deals with the work of the department during the past year. It is a very interesting and informative account of the work of the department during the past year.

4. The fourth part of the report deals with the work of the department during the past year. It is a very interesting and informative account of the work of the department during the past year.

5. The fifth part of the report deals with the work of the department during the past year. It is a very interesting and informative account of the work of the department during the past year.

6. The sixth part of the report deals with the work of the department during the past year. It is a very interesting and informative account of the work of the department during the past year.



